

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

2 Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)
dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com
3 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
4 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: (312) 705-7400
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

6 Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com
7 Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com
8 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
9 Telephone: (213) 443-3000
10 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)
josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com
1300 I. Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202-538-8000
Facsimile: 202-538-8100

11 Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)
12 jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
13 San Francisco, CA 94111
14 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

Jomaire A. Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: (212) 849-7000
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

15 *Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC*

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION

19 CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,
20 JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER
CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO,
21 individually and on behalf of all similarly
situated,

22 Plaintiffs,

23 v.

24 GOOGLE LLC,
25 Defendant.

Case No. 5:20-cv-03664-LHK-SVK

**ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL
JOINT SUBMISSION IN RESPONSE TO
DKT. 147, 147-1**

Referral: Hon. Susan van Keulen, USMJ

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) respectfully
 3 seeks to seal certain portions of the parties’ Joint Submission submitted pursuant to the Court’s April
 4 30 Discovery Order, Dkt. 147, 147-1 (“Joint Submission”), which contains non-public, sensitive
 5 confidential and proprietary business information that could affect Google’s competitive standing and
 6 may expose Google to increased security risks if publicly disclosed and information that contains,
 7 summarizes, or reflects material designated “Confidential or “Highly Confidential – Attorneys’ Eyes
 8 Only” by Plaintiffs. This Court has previously sealed the same information. Dkt. 152. This
 9 Administrative Motion pertains for the following information contained in the Joint Submission:

Document	Portions to be Filed Under Seal	Party Claiming Confidentiality
Joint Submission	Portions Highlighted in Yellow at 2, 3 (P3)	Google

13 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

14 A party seeking to seal material must “establish[] that the document, or portions thereof, are
 15 privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law” (*i.e.*, is
 16 “sealable”). Civ. L.R. 79-5(b). The sealing request must also “be narrowly tailored to seek sealing
 17 only of sealable material.” *Id.*

18 In the context of dispositive motions, materials may be sealed in the Ninth Circuit upon a
 19 showing that there are “compelling reasons” to seal the information. *See Kamakana v. City & Cty. of*
Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179-80 (9th Cir. 2006). However, a party seeking to seal information in a
 20 non-dispositive motion must show only “good cause.” *Id.* at 1179-80. The rationale for the lower
 21 standard with respect to non-dispositive motions is that “the public has less of a need for access to
 22 court records attached only to non-dispositive motions because these documents are often unrelated,
 23 or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action” and that as a result “[t]he public
 24 policies that support the right of access to dispositive motions, and related materials, do not apply with
 25 equal force to non-dispositive materials.” *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179; *see also TVIIM, LLC v.*
McAfee, Inc., 2015 WL 5116721, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2015) (“Records attached to non-

1 dispositive motions are not subject to the strong presumption of access.”) (citation omitted). Under
 2 the “good cause” standard, courts will seal statements reporting on a company’s users, sales,
 3 investments, or other information that is ordinarily kept secret for competitive purposes. *See*
 4 *Hanginout, Inc. v. Google, Inc.*, 2014 WL 1234499, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 24, 2014); *Nitride*
 5 *Semiconductors Co. v. RayVio Corp.*, 2018 WL 10701873, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2018) (granting
 6 motion to seal “[c]onfidential and proprietary information regarding [Defendant]’s products” under
 7 “good cause” standard) (Van Keulen, J.).

8 A discovery statement is non-dispositive, and thus the good cause standard applies. *See e.g.*
 9 *Pietersen v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 2018 WL 10362631, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 8, 2018) (“The
 10 parties have filed two separate motions to seal portions of the discovery letter briefs that are pending
 11 before the Court. Because the sealing requests were made in conjunction with a non-dispositive
 12 discovery motion, a showing under the good cause standard will suffice.”). Although the materials
 13 that Google seeks to seal here easily meet the higher “compelling reasons” standard, the Court need
 14 only consider whether these materials meet the lower “good cause” standard.

15 **III. THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED MATERIALS SHOULD ALL BE SEALED**

16 Courts have repeatedly found it appropriate to seal documents that contain “business
 17 information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435
 18 U.S. 589, 589-99 (1978). Good cause to seal is shown when a party seeks to seal materials that
 19 “contain[] confidential information about the operation of [the party’s] products and that public
 20 disclosure could harm [the party] by disclosing confidential technical information.” *Digital Reg of*
 21 *Texas, LLC v. Adobe Sys., Inc.*, 2014 WL 6986068, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2014). Materials that
 22 could harm a litigant’s competitive standing may be sealed even under the “compelling reasons”
 23 standard. *See e.g. Icon-IP Pty Ltd. v. Specialized Bicycle Components, Inc.*, 2015 WL 984121, at *2
 24 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2015) (information “is appropriately sealable under the ‘compelling reasons’
 25 standard where that information could be used to the company’s competitive disadvantage”) (citation
 26 omitted). Courts in this district have also determined that motions to seal may be granted as to
 27 potential trade secrets. *See, e.g. United Tactical Sys., LLC v. Real Action Paintball, Inc.*, 2015 WL
 28

1 295584, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2015) (rejecting argument against sealing “that [the party] ha[s] not
 2 shown that the substance of the information . . . amounts to a trade secret”).

3 Here the Joint Discovery Statement comprises confidential and proprietary information
 4 regarding highly sensitive features of Google’s internal systems and operations that Google does not
 5 share publicly. Specifically, this information provides details related to the cookies Google uses
 6 internally and their proprietary functions. Such information reveals Google’s internal strategies,
 7 system designs, and business practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services
 8 while complying with its legal and privacy obligations.

9 Public disclosure of the above-listed information would harm Google’s competitive standing it
 10 has earned through years of innovation and careful deliberation, by revealing sensitive aspects of
 11 Google’s proprietary systems, strategies, and designs to Google’s competitors. That alone is a proper
 12 basis to seal such information. *See, e.g., Free Range Content, Inc. v. Google Inc.*, No. 14-cv-02329-
 13 BLF, Dkt. No. 192, at 3-9 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2017) (granting Google’s motion to seal certain sensitive
 14 business information related to Google’s processes and policies to ensure the integrity and security of
 15 a different advertising system); *Huawei Techs., Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. 3:16-cv-02787-WHO,
 16 Dkt. No. 446, at 19 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2019) (sealing confidential sales data because “disclosure
 17 would harm their competitive standing by giving competitors insight they do not have”); *Trotsky v.
 18 Travelers Indem. Co.*, 2013 WL 12116153, at *8 (W.D. Wash. May 8, 2013) (granting motion to seal
 19 as to “internal research results that disclose statistical coding that is not publically available”).

20 Moreover, if publicly disclosed, malicious actors may use such information to seek to
 21 compromise Google’s internal identifier systems. Google would be placed at an increased risk of
 22 cyber security threats. *See, e.g., In re Google Inc. Gmail Litig.*, 2013 WL 5366963, at *3 (N.D. Cal.
 23 Sept. 25, 2013) (sealing “material concern[ing] how users’ interactions with the Gmail system affects
 24 how messages are transmitted” because if made public, it “could lead to a breach in the security of the
 25 Gmail system”). The security threat is an additional reason for this Court to seal the identified
 26 information.

27 **IV. CONCLUSION**

28

1 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should seal the identified portions of the Joint
2 Submission.

3 DATED: May 6, 2021

4 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
5 SULLIVAN, LLP

6 By /s/ Andrew H. Schapiro

7 Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)
8 andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com
9 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
10 Chicago, IL 60606
11 Telephone: (312) 705-7400
12 Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

13 Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
14 stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com
15 Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
16 violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com
17 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
18 Los Angeles, CA 90017
19 Telephone: (213) 443-3000
20 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

21 Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)
22 dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com
23 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
24 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
25 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
26 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

27 Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)
28 josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com
1300 I. Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202-538-8000
Facsimile: 202-538-8100

Jomaire A. Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: (212) 849-7000
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)
jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 875-6600

1 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

2 *Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC*

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28